REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 2 and 16 have been cancelled. It is respectfully requested that claims 2 and 16 be canceled without disclaimer or prejudice. It is currently believed that the claimed invention requires no clarification. Nevertheless, solely in order to expedite prosecution, claims 1, 11, 17-19, 23, 28 and 35 have been amended to further clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Therefore, claims 1, 3-15, 17-32 and 35-36 are pending.

In the Office Action, the Examiner withdrew the rejection of claims 1-10 and 28-31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the U.S. Patent No. 6,263,339 B1 (*Hirsch*) in view of the U.S. Patent No. 6,275,825 B1 (*Kobayashi et al.*). Examiner has also withdrawn the rejection of claims 16-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the U.S. Patent No. 6,434,552 B1 (*Leong*) in view of the U.S. Patent No. 6,493,700 B2 (*Couch et al.*). However, the Examiner has rejected the claims on new grounds. This rejection is fully traversed below.

Claim 1, among other things recites: defining at least one <u>expression associated with at least one record of said database.</u> It should be noted that the at least one expression is a <u>calculation expression that can be evaluated at least partly based on at least one field of said at least one record.</u>

In the Office Action, the Examiner has asserted that all of these features are taught by Col. 26, lines 28-33 of the U.S. Patent No. 6,236,996 (*Bapat et al.*) (Office Action, page 3, rejection of claim 2). It is noted that *Bapat et al.* states:

> Referring also to FIGS. 15A and 15B, permission entry 1502, 1504 is tuple having three fields, as shown below:
>
> (user name, object name, operation type).
>
> Although FIGS. 15A and 15B show the object name in each permission entry as a single "word," preferably the object name is the FDN for a managed object. (*Bapat et al.*, Col. 26, lines 28-33.)

It is earnestly believed that the permission entry 1502 described in Col. 26, lines 28-33 of *Bapat et al.* does not teach defining at least one expression

associated with at least one record of said database, wherein the expression is a calculation expression that can be evaluated at least partly based on at least one field of said at least one record. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection is improper for at least this reason and it should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection is improper and should be withdrawn for an additional reason because the Examiner has also asserted that Col. 16, lines 28-33 of *Bapat et al.* teaches an least one expression that is a calculation expression and can be evaluated at least partly based on <u>at least one state variable of said database</u> (Office Action, page 4, rejection of claim 3). Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, it is earnestly believed that these features are not described by the permission entry described in Col. 26, lines 28-33 of *Bapat et al.* Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection should be withdrawn for an additional reason.

Still further, it is respectfully submitted that the background of the invention does not teach or suggest a Graphical User Interface (GUI) that facilitate defining access privilege for a record based on an expression which is defined for that record. This is believed to be clearly evident. It is noted that a database program can provide a GUI. However, this in itself does not teach or suggest providing a GUI that can be used to perform a particular function (e.g., defining access privilege for at least one record, based on an expression). In addition, the material disclosed by the Applicant cannot be used to establish the motivation or suggestion for providing a GUI that performs the recited features of claims 16-18, 23-26, and 35-36.

Moreover, in order to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must a motivation or suggestion in the combination of references (MPEP §2143.01). The Examiner has asserted that in order to facilitate the invoking of a call, a call should be included in the database program to have a friendly system for defining access rights of a user (Office Action, page 7). It is respectfully submitted that the mere fact that the references can be combined or modified is NOT sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness (MPEP, §2143.01, third paragraph). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 17-18, 23-26, and 35-36 is improper for these additional reasons.

Finally, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has not even addressed all the recited features of claim 35. Per MPEP §2143.03, all claim limitations should be taught or suggested. Clearly, the background of the invention does not teach or suggest a Graphical User Interface that can facilitate defining access privilege for at least one record, based on an expression which is defined for at least one record, wherein the expression defines access privilege for at least one record which is stored or is to be created in said database. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness for yet additional reasons.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that all pending claims are believed to be patentably distinct over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed as the limitations discussed above are sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw all the rejections to the claims.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

No fees are believed to be due; however, if fees are found to be due, please charge any fees or credits, or any extensions of time, to Deposit Account No. 500338 (Order No. CLARP027).

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

R. Mahboubian
Reg. No. 44,890

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
(650) 961-8300